

as doubtful in the British list; and it would be well if this specimen, which is now in the Ipswich Museum, were carefully compared with examples of the Mute and Trumpeter Swans, so as to set the question finally at rest.

On the whole we confidently recommend Mr. Babington's Catalogue to all who take an interest in British birds.

Birds on the British List, their title to enrolment considered, especially with reference to the British Ornithological Union's List of British Birds, with a few Remarks on Evolution and Notes upon the rarer Eggs. By the Rev. GREGORY SMART, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: R. H. Porter, 1886.

SEVERAL Lists of British Birds have been published during the last few years, each one, to a large extent at least, filling up a void space in our ornithological literature; but we must confess that we fail to discover in what way the present List tends to supply any want in that direction. It appears to be a mere random collection of many of the doubtful species included in the British Ornithologists' (not Ornithological, as above stated) Union's List, together with many not referred to in that List, and which most undoubtedly never have been met with in the British Isles, some of which (as, for instance, *Mimus polyglottus*, *Lanius excubitoroides*, *Archibuteo sancti-johannis*, *Podilymbus podiceps*, &c.) appear to be included merely to afford an opportunity of describing their eggs in the author's collection. Judging, indeed, from the notes given by the author, we can only conclude that he is a mere egg-collector, with but little knowledge of ornithology or experience in natural history, as in many cases he appears to have got hopelessly befogged. For instance, he says (p. 41) that if the eggs of *Anthus ludovicianus* in his collection be authentic, "*Anthus ludovicianus* and *Anthus campestris* can scarcely be conspecific," a statement which he could never have made had he any acquaintance with these so totally distinct species. Again (p. 42), he quotes under *Anthus cervinus* a note by Mr. Robert Gray (not Grey) on *Anthus ludovicianus*, as if these two species were identical; and further to complicate matters, he remarks that, as "these birds have not been preserved, and Professor Newton is inclined to assign them to *rupestris*, it will depend on Grey's (*sic*) capability of distinguishing between the two forms"—thus inferring that Gray is doubtful of the distinctions between *Anthus rupestris* and *A. cervinus*. Both forms of Spotted Eagle are included in the List as British, whereas it would appear that only one (*Aquila clanga*) has really been proved to have occurred in Great Britain; and at p. 9, under his note on *Aquila clanga*, he describes the eggs of that species as having been taken in Pomerania, a locality where only *Aquila pomarina*, and not *Aquila clanga*, is known to nest.

Under the notes on *Acanthyllis (Chatura) caudacuta*, after stating

that its eggs are unknown, he proceeds to describe the eggs of a widely different Nearctic species, the Spine-tailed Swift, and remarks that he has "reason to believe that eggs of this species are passed off by some dealers for those of the Needle-tailed Swift" (*A. caud-acuta*)—a statement which, if correct, merely tends to show how very easily mere egg-collectors are imposed on by unscrupulous dealers.

No care appears to have been exercised in selecting the proper scientific names, either generic or specific, in accordance with the generally accepted rules of synonymy; and one finds therefore the Killdeer Plover rejoicing in the generic title of *Oxyechus*, the Spotted Sandpiper in that of *Tringoides*, and the Solitary Sandpiper in that of *Rhyacophilus*, whereas, on the other hand, both the Yellow-legged Sandpiper and the Bar-tailed Godwit are classed under *Totanus*.

At pp. 91 and 92 lists are given of the doubtful species which the author considers should be admitted in or excluded from the British List; and here we fail to see, judging from the evidence on record, why *Buteo lineatus*, *Coracias leucocephalus*, *Colaptes auratus*, *Charadrius virginicus (dominicus)*, *Podilymbus podiceps*, &c. should be admitted, and *Emberiza pusilla*, *Emberiza melanocephala*, *Motacilla viridis*, &c. excluded.

Many other comments and criticisms occur to us as we glance through the pages of this List, but we think that it will be useless to weary our readers with further remarks.

At the end of the List (pp. 97-148) "a few remarks on evolution" are given, and (pp. 150, 151) a "compendious scheme of Reconciliation between the Earth's Record compiled in the Nineteenth Century and the Divine Record delivered to Moses" is given in tabular form; and here, again, we can offer no further comment than that we think it would have been better both for the author and his readers had he studied the subject a little more closely and digested the vast amount of available material before committing his ideas to paper.

MISCELLANEOUS.

On a new Parasitic and Nidulant Rhabdocœlan (Fecampia erythrocephala). By M. A. GIARD.

THE curious Turbellarian which forms the subject of this note is very common on the shores of Fécamp and Yport. During a part of its existence it lives parasitically in Decapod Crustacea of various species—*Carcinus mœnas*, *Platycarcinus pagurus*, and *Pagurus Bernhardus*. *Carcinus mœnas* is the most commonly infested, but only when it is young; to find the parasite we must open crabs from $\frac{1}{5}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$ inch broad. The grey or blackish colour of the carapace reveals almost with certainty the presence of the *Fecampia*.

Ann. & Mag. N. Hist. Ser. 5. Vol. xviii. 22